

REMARKS

The office action continues to assert a reference which fails to teach a two address buffer. The fact that someone may teach two buffers, neither of which is a two address buffer, fails to make out a *prima facie* rejection. The claim is clear that the claimed buffer must be one buffer since the singular is used. Moreover, the claim is clear that that one buffer must have two addresses.


The suggestion that "the mere fact that there is more than one buffer does not indicate that each buffer is not a two address buffer" may, in fact, be true, but the converse is also true and the converse is more pertinent here. The converse is that just because they say they have two buffers, does not teach that each of the buffers is a two address buffer.

Surely, the Examiner will concede that a two address buffer is an unusual entity. There is nothing whatsoever in the reference that suggests that either of the cited buffers is a two address buffer. Silence in the reference does not make out a teaching of the claimed invention. Silence makes out a failure to establish a *prima facie* rejection.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 16, 2007



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation